



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENT  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

JGJr: 03-03

Paper No:10

PERKINS COIE LLP  
PATENT-SEA  
P.O. BOX 1247  
SEATTLE WA 98111-1247

**COPY MAILED**  
**MAR 17 2003**  
**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of:  
Gonzalo  
Filed: 20 September, 1999  
Application No. 09/399,415  
Docket No.: (None)

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition filed herein on 4 March, 2003, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a)<sup>1</sup> to revive the above-identified application.

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**.

NOTES:

- (1) Any petition (and fee) for reconsideration of this decision under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) (as to unavoidable delay) or an alternative request for relief under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)<sup>2</sup> (as to unintentional delay) must be submitted within two (2)

<sup>1</sup> A Petition filed under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application for patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof;
- (2) the petition fee required by 37 C.F.R. §1.17(l);
- (3) A showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the reply due date until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to the is paragraph was unavoidable; and
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(c).

An application is "unavoidably" abandoned only where Petitioner (or Petitioner's counsel) takes all action necessary for a proper response to the outstanding Office action, but through the intervention of unforeseen circumstances, the response is not timely received in the Office. That is, in the context of ordinary human affairs the test is such care as is generally used and observed by prudent and careful persons in relation to their most important business. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31 (Comm'r Pat. 1887); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r. Pat. 1913).

<sup>2</sup> Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b). a grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.
- (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(m);
- (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37

months from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a)"; and/or "Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)";

- (2) Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter.
- (3) While as the Applicant, Petitioner herein certainly may prosecute his own application, there is no indication that petitioner herein ever revoked from Counsel the power to prosecute the instant application. The Office will correspond with only one person in regard prosecution.<sup>3</sup> If Petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate revocation of power of attorney documentation must be submitted.

---

C.F.R. §1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(c). (Emphasis supplied.)

<sup>3</sup> The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.33 provide:

**§ 1.33 Correspondence respecting patent applications, reexamination proceedings, and other proceedings.**

(a) *Correspondence address and daytime telephone number.* When filing an application, a correspondence address must be set forth in either an application data sheet (§ 1.76), or elsewhere, in a clearly identifiable manner, in any paper submitted with an application filing. If no correspondence address is specified, the Office may treat the mailing address of the first named inventor (if provided, see §§ 1.76(b)(1) and 1.63(c)(2)) as the correspondence address. The Office will direct all notices, official letters, and other communications relating to the application to the correspondence address. The Office will not engage in double correspondence with an applicant and a registered attorney or agent, or with more than one registered attorney or agent except as deemed necessary by the Commissioner. If more than one correspondence address is specified, the Office will establish one as the correspondence address. For the party to whom correspondence is to be addressed, a daytime telephone number should be supplied in a clearly identifiable manner and may be changed by any party who may change the correspondence address. The correspondence address may be changed as follows:

(1) *Prior to filing of § 1.63 oath or declaration by any of the inventors.* If a § 1.63 oath or declaration has not been filed by any of the inventors, the correspondence address may be changed by the party who filed the application. If the application was filed by a registered attorney or agent, any other registered practitioner named in the transmittal papers may also change the correspondence address. Thus, the inventor(s), any registered practitioner named in the transmittal papers accompanying the original application, or a party that will be the assignee who filed the application, may change the correspondence address in that application under this paragraph.

(2) *Where a § 1.63 oath or declaration has been filed by any of the inventors.* If a § 1.63 oath or declaration has been filed, or is filed concurrent with the filing of an application, by any of the inventors, the correspondence address may be changed by the parties set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, except for paragraph (b)(2).

(b) *Amendments and other papers.* Amendments and other papers, except for written assertions, pursuant to § 1.27(c)(2)(ii) of this part, filed in the application must be signed by:

(1) A registered attorney or agent of record appointed in compliance with § 1.34(b);

(2) A registered attorney or agent not of record who acts in a representative capacity under the provisions of § 1.34(a);

(3) An assignee as provided for under § 3.71(b) of this chapter; or

(4) All of the applicants (§ 1.41(b)) for patent, unless there is an assignee of the entire interest and such assignee has taken action in the application in accordance with § 3.71 of this chapter.

© All notices, official letters, and other communications for the patent owner or owners in a reexamination proceeding will be directed to the attorney or agent of record (see § 1.34(b)) in the patent file at the address listed on the register of patent attorneys and agents maintained pursuant to §§ 10.5 and 10.11 or, if no attorney or agent is of record, to the patent owner or owners at the address or addresses of record.

Amendments and other papers filed in a reexamination proceeding on behalf of the patent owner must be signed by the patent owner, or if there is more than one owner by all the owners, or by an attorney or agent of record in the patent file, or by a registered attorney or agent not of record who acts in a representative capacity under the provisions of § 1.34(a). Double correspondence with the patent owner or owners and the patent owner's attorney or agent, or with more than one attorney or agent, will not be undertaken.

If more than one attorney or agent is of record and a correspondence address has not been specified, correspondence will be held with the last attorney or agent made of record.

(d) A "correspondence address" or change thereto may be filed with the Patent and Trademark Office during the enforceable life of the patent. The "correspondence address" will be used in any correspondence relating to maintenance fees unless a separate fee address" has been specified. See § 1.363 for "fee address" used solely for maintenance fee purposes. [36 FR 12617, July 2, 1971; 46 FR 29181, May 29, 1981; para. (d) added, 49 FR 34724, Aug. 31, 1984, effective Nov. 1, 1984; para. (c), 50 FR 5171, Feb. 6, 1985, effective Mar. 8, 1985; paras. (a) & (b) revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997; paras. (a) and (b) revised, 65 FR 54604, Sept. 8, 2000, effective Nov. 7, 2000]

A courtesy copy of this decision will be mailed to Petitioner.

However, all future correspondence will be directed to the address of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

### BACKGROUND

The record indicates that:

- Applicant failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 19 February, 2002, with reply due (absent extension of time) on or before Monday, 20 May, 2002;
- the application went abandoned after midnight 20 May, 2002;
- Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 2 October, 2002;
- in his "showing," Petitioner acknowledges that his attorneys received the Office action on 25 February, 2002 (less than a week after it was mailed), but contends that because he did not receive those materials from his attorneys until 19 May, 2002, the period of response should have been reset;
- further, although Petitioner's statement clearly indicates that at the time of his receipt of the Office action from his Counsel Petitioner  
--had time to submit a reply within the shortened statutory period, and  
--could have submitte a request and fee for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a),  
however, Petitioner failed to do either;
- rather, Petitioner sought--unsuccessfully--to prevail upon the Examiner to restart the period for reply;<sup>4</sup>
- as of this writing, Petitioner has failed to reply to the Office action mailed to his Counsel on 19 February, 2002--more than a year ago.

---

<sup>4</sup> Petitioner wrote to the Examiner asking that the reply period be restarted (letter dated 10 June, filed 9 July, 2002. (As noted above, the Examiner did not comply with that request.) In that letter, Petitioner stated that he was sending further materials, which Petitioner apparently failed to do.

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>5</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority.

The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>6</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>7</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>8</sup>

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>9</sup> Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>10</sup>))

#### Allegations as to Unavoidable Delay

A delay is not "unavoidable" when there is no documentary support of the allegation or when an

---

<sup>5</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>6</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>7</sup> See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 *Fed. Reg.* at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>8</sup> See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

<sup>9</sup> See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra*.

<sup>10</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

applicant simply permits the maximum extendable statutory period for reply to expire.<sup>11</sup> In determining if a delay was unavoidable, decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the standard of the reasonably prudent person acting in their most important business matters.<sup>12</sup> In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account."<sup>13</sup>

As to the petition alleging to unavoidable delay, Petitioner again has failed to support the allegation.

Accordingly, in view of the failure of the showing herein and the above-described record, the petition to revive as to unavoidable delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) must be and hereby is **dismissed**.

#### ALTERNATIVE VENUE

If Petitioner is unable to make a showing of unavoidable delay surpassing that tendered heretofore, Petitioner's only alternative to irretrievable abandonment is to file a petition and fee as set forth at NOTE 1, above at pages 1 and 2, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), and state therein that "the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) was unintentional."

Thus, Petitioner may wish to supplement his petition to plead alternatively under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) wherein the "showing" burden is much less onerous.

Petitioner is cautioned that failure to submit such a petition 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) timely may be viewed as intentional delay and an absolute bar to revival.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Box DAC  
Washington, D.C. 20231

By FAX: (703) 308-6916  
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Crystal Plaza Four, Suite CP4-3C23  
2201 South Clark Place

---

<sup>11</sup> See MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(C)(2).

<sup>12</sup> Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" "is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business"); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r Pat. 1913).

<sup>13</sup> Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Gillon', with a large loop at the end.

John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

cc:

Steven Gonzalo  
2920 E. 15th Road  
Ottawa, IL 61350